

REMARKS

In the August 5, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claim 1 (and its dependent claims 4 and 5) and independent claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamaoka et al. '572 patent in view of the Watanabe '741 patent and the Zhang et al. '476 patent. The Examiner stated that claims 3, 6-13 (which depend from claim 1) and claims 16-20 (which depend from claim 14) would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As indicated above, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 3. Claim 3 has been cancelled.

Similarly, independent claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 16. Claim 16 has been cancelled.

In view of the above, it is believed that all claims now present in this application are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: November 2, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Pollock (Reg. No. 29,098)

Attorneys for Applicant(s)